

## Cluster Area I: General Supervision

**Question:** Is effective general supervision of the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ensured through the State education agency's (SEA) utilization of mechanisms that result in all eligible children with disabilities having an opportunity to receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE)?

**Probes:**

- GS.I Do the general supervision instruments and procedures (including monitoring, complaint and hearing resolution, etc.), used by the SEA, identify and correct IDEA noncompliance in a timely manner?
- GS.II Are systemic issues identified and remediated through the analysis of findings from information and data collected from all available sources, including monitoring, complaint investigations, and hearing resolutions?
- GS.III Are complaint investigations, mediations, and due process hearings and reviews completed in a timely manner?
- GS.IV Are there sufficient numbers of administrators, teachers, related services providers, paraprofessionals, and other providers to meet the identified educational needs of all children with disabilities in the State?
- GS.V Do State procedures and practices ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data?

**State Goal (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

- Effective general supervision of the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is ensured through the State education agency's (SEA) utilization of mechanisms that result in all eligible children with disabilities having an opportunity to receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

**State Goals Established during Improvement Planning (submitted July 1, 2003):**

- The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has a proper method of monitoring and ensuring compliance in all programs providing special education and related services to youth with disabilities in city and county jails.
- The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ensures that general and special education personnel are trained in appropriate content to improve the achievement of students with disabilities grades K-4.\*
- The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ensures that general and special education personnel are trained in the appropriate content to improve post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities. \*
- Special education personnel reporting system is used for data-based decisions to assist in improving the achievement of students with disabilities.\*

\*Also goal/indicator for students who are non-disabled.

**Performance Indicators (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

- GS.I The general supervision instruments and procedures (including monitoring, complaint and hearing resolution, etc.), used by the SEA, identify and correct IDEA noncompliance in a timely manner.
- GS.II Systemic issues are identified and remediated through the analysis of findings from information and data collected from all available sources, including monitoring, complaint investigations, and hearing resolutions.
- GS.III Complaint investigations, mediations, and due process hearings and reviews are completed in a timely manner.
- GS.IV There are sufficient numbers of administrators, teachers, related services providers, paraprofessionals, and other providers to meet the identified educational needs of all children with disabilities in the State.
- GS.V State procedures and practices ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data.

**GS.I The general supervision instruments and procedures (including monitoring, complaint and hearing resolution, etc.), used by the SEA, identify and correct IDEA noncompliance in a timely manner.**

**1. Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

**District data for the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle of monitoring (1996-97 through 2000-01)**

Year	# initial reviews	# requiring follow-up 1	# requiring follow-up 2	# requiring follow-up 3	# requiring follow-up 4	% non-compliant at initial review
1996-97	107	85	20	6	0	79.4%
1997-98	103	80	20	5	0	77.7%
1998-99	94	87	35	9	0	92.6%
1999-00	117	103	29	1	0	88.0%
2000-01	108	89	4	0	0	82.4%

**District data for 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle of monitoring (2001-02 through 2005-06)**

Year	# initial reviews	# requiring follow-up 1	# requiring follow-up 2	# requiring follow-up 3	# requiring follow-up 4	% non-compliant at initial review
2001-02	102	87 (76 completed 11 not completed)	27 (15 completed 12 not completed)	6		85.3%
2002-03	100	95 (3 completed 92 not completed)	1			95.0%
2003-04	110 (70 reviews completed as of 3/30/04)	46				

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04

Formulas: Percent of districts non-compliance = Number of districts out of compliance at initial review/Total districts reviewed

Initial monitoring reviews find at least one area of noncompliance in 80-90% of districts, indicating that noncompliance is being identified. Many of the districts are found in compliance at the first follow-up; however, approximately 20-30% require second follow-ups. Performance indicators found out of compliance require an assurance statement from the district and are not included in the follow-up reviews except as desk audits of data.

As of March 30, 2004, there are 12 second follow-ups that have not yet been completed on district reviews initially held in 2001-02. These incomplete reviews are currently in process. Two are scheduled as on-site reviews and the remainder will be desk reviews of information submitted by the districts. All final reports will be issued by September 1, 2004.

**2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

- Focus monitoring and technical assistance on areas identified as problem areas in previous monitoring and child complaints.

**3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

Missouri is currently in the third year of a five-year monitoring cycle during which all school districts in the state are reviewed. Special Education monitoring is completed in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) district review and accreditation process. For a full description of the Special Education Monitoring system, see <http://www.dese.state.mo.us/divspeced/Compliance/MSIP/index.html>. In brief, districts attend training and complete a self-assessment the year prior to the MSIP review. The self-assessments are submitted to the Division and monitoring staff use the self-assessment results combined with a desk review to determine which districts will receive an on-site monitoring. Some monitoring standards and indicators have been changed slightly during this cycle in response to findings from previous years, but the majority of the review has been consistent for this cycle. Performance standards are increasingly becoming more of a focus.

Alan Coulter from the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (funded by OSEP) will be working with Missouri to establish more of a focused monitoring system for the next five-year cycle.

**4. Projected Targets:**

- Continue to focus on areas identified as problem areas in previous monitoring and child complaints
- The percent of districts found out of compliance on initial reviews decreases
- The percent of districts found out of compliance on child complaints decreases
- Additional targets are included in the Future Activities Table

**5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:**

See also GS.V

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
1.1.1 GS.I	A) Convene a meeting of stakeholders (District special education directors, law enforcement, Department of Social Services, Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Corrections, Missouri Juvenile Justice Association) to discuss development and implementation of procedures to make a timely identification of students with disabilities held in city and county jails and provide required special education or related services.	1.1.1.1 Meeting convened 1.1.1.2 Plan developed 1.1.1.3 Plan implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FY04 plan implemented</li> <li>• FY04 monitoring results indicate that youth with disabilities incarcerated in city and county jails are being located and provided with services in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	<b>Timelines:</b> <b>December 2003</b> <b>Plan Implemented</b>  <b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance Monitoring system reports.  <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
1.1.2 GS.I	B) Written Technical Assistance distributed to stakeholders to inform them of the state and federal requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to locate and provide services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	1.1.2.1 Listserv message to districts 1.1.2.2 Content of technical assistance developed 1.1.2.3 Dissemination method identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FY04 technical information distributed</li> <li>FY04 monitoring results indicate that youth with disabilities incarcerated in city/county jails are located and provided services in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	<b>Timelines:</b> <b>August 2003 - July 2004</b> <b>Information distributed</b>  <b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance  <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B
1.1.3 GS.I	C) FY04 Monitoring procedures revised to incorporate interview of district staff and student file review specific to locating and providing services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	1.1.3.1 Monitoring procedures revised and implemented 1.1.3.2 Interview questions developed 1.1.3.3 File review procedures updated 1.1.3.4 Revised procedures implemented with 2003-2004 MSIP districts (includes Kansas City and St. Louis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised procedures implemented</li> </ul>	<b>Timeline s:</b> <b>September 2003</b>  <b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance  <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B
1.1.5 GS.I GS.II	E) District special education monitoring self-assessment (SEMSA) revised to include reporting of district procedures to locate and provide services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	1.1.5.1 Data obtained on district procedures to locate and provide services to youth with disabilities incarcerated in city/county jails.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District special education monitoring self-assessment (SEMSA) includes procedures for locating and providing services to youth with disabilities</li> </ul>	<b>Timelines:</b> <b>September 2003</b> <b>Revisions developed (for SEMSA due April 1, 2004)</b>  <b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance Monitoring system reports  <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B

**GS.II Systemic issues are identified and remediated through the analysis of findings from information and data collected from all available sources, including monitoring, complaint investigations and hearing resolutions.**

**1. Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

Districts complete a Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) the year prior to their monitoring review. Self-assessment results are compared to results of file reviews conducted by monitoring staff. Comparisons show a high level of agreement. The desk reviews that are conducted by monitoring staff include looking at the district SEMSAs as well as any child complaint or hearing decision information for that district. Selections of districts that will receive an on-site visit are based on all of this information.

The following table comparatively summarizes monitoring and child complaint issues for school year 2002-2003.

**COMPARISON OF MONITORING AND CHILD COMPLAINT FINDINGS:**

AREA	MONITORING		CHILD COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS		
Evaluation	Children with disabilities receive timely evaluations, including children transitioning from Part C, if applicable.	43.46% noncompliant	Evaluations/Reevaluations (General)	9/19 allegations out of compliance =	47.37% noncompliant
	Evaluations are appropriately administered, including evaluations for children transitioning from Part C, if applicable.	64.25% noncompliant	Conduct of the Evaluation	13/42 allegations out of compliance =	30.95% noncompliant
	Parents are afforded the opportunity to provide information that is used in the evaluations.	29.47% noncompliant	Timelines	15/34 allegations out of compliance =	44.12% noncompliant
	Eligibility criteria are applied appropriately for all initial evaluation.	22.22% noncompliant	All evaluation complaints	38/105 allegations out of compliance =	36.19% noncompliant
	Parents and children with disabilities are involved, when appropriate, in the evaluation and eligibility determination process.	51.32% noncompliant			
Transfer Procedures	The public agency implements required procedures for students who transfer from another state or from another Missouri district.	28.49% noncompliant	Transfer Procedures	8/16 allegations out of compliance =	50.00% noncompliant
Procedural Safeguards	Prior Written Notice is provided to parents and children, when appropriate, as required by state and federal regulations.	54.45% noncompliant	Provision of Notice	15/80 allegations out of compliance =	18.75% noncompliant

AREA	MONITORING		CHILD COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS		
Secondary Transition	Children with disabilities, beginning at age 14, have IEPs that focus on a course of study related to transition objectives.	31.38% noncompliant	Post-Secondary Transition	2/6 allegations out of compliance =	33.33% noncompliant
	Children with disabilities, beginning at age 16, have IEPs that coordinate instruction (including related services), community and employment experiences, adult living objectives, and linkages with other service providers or agencies as determined appropriate to meet the post secondary goals of the student.	22.84% non compliant			
Special Education and Related Services (continued on next page)	Special Education and related services are provided as specified by the child's IEP.	22.00% noncompliant	Failure to provide services	19/75 allegations out of compliance =	25.33% noncompliant
	Children with disabilities are provided supplementary aids and services, accommodations and modifications to support success in regular education settings.	34.95% noncompliant	IEP Implementation	56/153 allegations out of compliance =	36.60% noncompliant
	The IEP provides for involvement and progress in the general education curriculum.	54.12% noncompliant	Special Education and Related Services (general)	4/25 allegations out of compliance =	16.00% noncompliant
	Special factors (e.g., behavior, limited English proficiency, Braille, communication needs, and assistive technology services/devices) are taken into consideration when developing the IEP.	21.83% noncompliant	Failure to address	2/9 allegations out of compliance =	22.22% noncompliant
			Assistive Technology	4/7 allegations out of compliance =	57.14% noncompliant
			Progress Reports	8/23 allegations out of compliance =	34.80% noncompliant
			Provision of copy of IEP	8/19 out of compliance =	42.11% noncompliant

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04.

Comparisons of monitoring and child complaint data suggest monitoring of districts scheduled for review are helping to identify if particular systemic issues exist. Data show that areas found out of compliance in monitoring reviews are also the basis for child complaints. Three particular monitoring items exhibit higher percents of noncompliance as compared to percents of child complaint allegations, i.e. appropriate administration of evaluations (Evaluation), the provision of prior written notice (Procedural Safeguards), and IEP providing for involvement in the general curriculum (Special Education and Related Services). All were about 30% higher suggesting monitoring of these items may be helping to redress the need for child complaint allegations.

#### Monitoring Data:

##### General Administration 5 -- The public agency conducts a program evaluation as required

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	92	5	0	1	1		5.4%
2002-2003	90	8	7	1	1		8.9%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04.

Note: Monitoring data based on Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) submitted by district.

Formulas: Percent of districts reviewed out of compliance = Number of districts out of compliance at initial review/Total districts reviewed

These data, based on each district's Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA), show that the majority of districts are completing the Annual Program Evaluation as required in the Missouri State Plan for Special Education.

#### 2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

- Systemic issues are identified and remediated through the analysis of data from all available sources.

#### 3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

The development and implementation of the Compliance Monitoring System to collect and maintain data in school year 2001-2002 provided integral monitoring information which can then be compared to child complaint data. The SEMSA and monitoring processes use all available data from monitoring, child complaints, due process hearings and anecdotal information.

#### 4. Projected Targets:

- Systemic issues are identified and remediated through the analysis of data from all available sources.
- Additional targets are included in the Future Activities table

**5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:**

See also GS.I, GS.V, BF.VI and BT

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
1.1.4 GS.II	D) FY04 monitoring results analyzed to determine level of understanding and compliance with IDEA requirements for locating and providing services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	1.1.4.1 Revised procedures implemented 1.1.4.2 Data entered into system 1.1.4.3 Reports generated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data obtained on extent of understanding and compliance with IDEA requirements for locating and providing services to youth with disabilities incarcerated in city/county jails.</li> </ul>	<b>Timelines:</b> July 2005  <b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance Monitoring system reports  <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B



**GS.III Complaint investigations, mediations, and due process hearings and reviews are completed in a timely manner.**

**1. Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

See Attachment 1 – Dispute Resolution - Complaints, Mediations, and Due Process Hearings Baseline/Trend Data.

**Descriptions of Due Process Hearing and Child Complaint Systems:**

Due Process Hearing System

The Due Process Hearing system in the State of Missouri is a one-tier system consisting of a state-level, three-member Hearing Panel for Part B, a single Hearing Officer for Part C and a single Hearing Officer for Expedited Hearings in Part B. The Part C Hearing Officer and the Part B Expedited Hearing Officer are attorneys under contract with the State of Missouri. The Part B hearing panel is composed of two trained lay officers, one selected by each party, and a Hearing Chair who is an attorney on contract with the State of Missouri. Both the Part B and Part C Due Process Hearing systems incorporate all requirements as specified in the Part B Federal Regulations at 300.506 through 300.514 and the Part C Federal Regulations at 303.419 through 303.425.

Requests for a Due Process Hearing must be made in writing to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Special Education. For the Part B hearing system, within (10) days of the date of the filing of a request, the parties must have identified their choice for a hearing officer. Within fifteen (15) days of the receipt of the request, a Hearing Chair is selected and the panel empowered.

Upon receipt of a request for a hearing, both parties are offered the opportunity for Mediation. Both parties must agree to enter into Mediation and agree on a trained Mediator from a list that is provided. If mediation is successful, a written agreement is developed. All discussions during mediations are confidential and may not be used in any subsequent due process hearings or civil proceedings.

In the Part B system, prior to filing a request for a Due Process Hearing, the parent may submit a request to the Local Education Agency (LEA) for an Informal Resolution Conference. A parent request for a Due Process Hearing is considered to be a waiver of their right to an Information Resolution Conference. In this case, the LEA may conduct the Resolution Conference and notify the parent of the results or they may waive the conduct of the conference.

If either party does not agree with the hearing decision, they may appeal the findings and decision in either state or federal court. The decision of the Due Process Hearing Panel is a final decision, unless a party to the hearing appeals.

Child Complaint System

A child complaint may be filed by any individual or organization that believes there has been a violation of any state or federal regulation implementing the IDEA in either the Part B or Part C system. The complaint must be filed in writing with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Special Education, unless it is determined that the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint. The child complaint procedures for Parts B and C incorporate all of the requirements as specified in the Part B Federal Regulations at 300.660 through 300.662 and the Part C Federal Regulations at 303.510 through 303.512.

Child complaints are investigated by a staff member of the Division of Special Education. Decisions are issued by the Commissioner of Education within sixty (60) days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined that a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint.

In resolving a complaint in which it is found that a Responsible Public Agency is out of compliance, the Department addresses within its decision how to remediate the compliance violation, including as appropriate, the awarding of monetary reimbursement or other corrective action appropriate to the needs of the child; and appropriate future provision of services for all children with disabilities. If needed, technical assistance activities and negotiations are undertaken. If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the part(s) of the complaint that are being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing.

If an issue is raised in a complaint that has previously been decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties, the hearing decision is binding. A complaint alleging a school district's failure to implement a due process decision is resolved by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE).

### Monitoring Data:

#### Child Complaints

School Year	Total Child Complaints		Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline	
	Total Filed	Total Decisions	#	%
2001-2002	125	113	6	5.3%
2002-2003	166	150	3	2.0%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education – Child Complaint Database as of 02/25/2004

Formulas: Percent of Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline = Number of Child Complaints Beyond 60 Days/Total Decisions

#### Child Complaint Allegations

School Year	Total Allegations	Allegations Found Out of Compliance	
	#	#	%
2001-2002	405	107	26.4%
2002-2003	505	108	21.4%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education – Child Complaint Database as of 02/25/2004

Formulas: Percent of Allegations Found Out of Compliance = Number of Allegations Found Out of Compliance/Total Allegations

#### Corrective Action Plans (CAP) for Child Complaint Allegations Found Out of Compliance

School Year	Corrective Action Plans Extending Beyond 45 Days				Total CAPs Beyond 45 Day Timeline	
	Total with Granted Extension Date	Total Given and Meeting Granted Extension Date	Total Not Meeting Granted Extension Date	Total without Granted Extension Date	#	%
2001-2002	18	18	0	30	30	28.0%
2002-2003	13	10	3	24	27	25.0%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Child Complaint Database as of 02/25/2004

Formulas: Percent of CAPs Beyond 45 Day Timeline = Number of CAPs Beyond 45 Day Timeline/Total Allegations Found Out of Compliance

**Due Process Hearing Requests**

School Year	Total Due Process Hearing Requests				Total Due Process Hearings Beyond 45 Day Timeline	
	Total Number Filed	Total Withdrawn	Total Pending	Total Decisions	#	%
2001-2002	70	53	3	14	1	5.9%
2002-2003	96	68	6	22	0	0.0%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Child Complaint Database as of 02/25/2004

Notes: Data reflects the school year in which the due process hearing requests were filed.

Formulas: Percent of Due Process Hearings Beyond 45 Day Timeline = Number of Due Process Hearings Beyond 45 Day Timeline/(Total Decisions + Total Pending)

**Mediations**

School Year	Total Mediation Agreements Beyond 30 Day Timeline	
	Number	Percent
2001-2002	0	0.0%
2002-2003	0	0.0%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Child Complaint Database as of 02/25/2004

With respect to monitoring data (including Attachment 1), data suggest improvements in timelines within the Due Process Hearing and Child Complaint Systems. The percent of child complaints beyond 60 days decreased from 5.3% to 2.0%. The percent of Corrective Action Plans beyond the 45 day timeline for child complaint allegations found out of compliance decreased from 28.0% to 25.0%. Due Process hearings beyond the 45 day timeline (without the required extension) are rare, i.e. only three instances in approximately thirteen years. All three instances resulted in sanctions and/or removal of the hearing officers involved. One of these instances occurred in school year 2001-2002, but the rarity of such an occurrence suggests no resultant decline in timeliness for that year. With respect to successful mediations, all were completed within timelines, i.e. within 30 days of the agreement to mediate.

**2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

All complaint investigations, mediations and due process hearing and reviews are completed within timelines.

**3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

In school year 2001-2002, the Division of Special Education created a position of Child Complaint Coordinator. This change was due to the number of extensions in prior years and the workloads of other monitoring supervisors. Having one person to coordinate all activities regarding child complaints has been instrumental in decreasing the number of child complaint extensions. Also, the creation of the new child complaint database, implemented in 2001-02, provides a regular report of child complaints that are nearing the end of timelines. Staff query the database for corrective actions that have not been received within forty-five days of the decision. If a corrective action is late, the district is contacted and, in many cases, this contact results in the district providing documentation that the corrective action has been implemented.

**4. Projected Targets:**

- All complaint investigations, mediations and due process hearing and reviews are completed within timelines.

**5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:**

Present activities will be continued for maintenance of present target.

**GS.IV There are sufficient numbers of administrators, teachers, related services providers, paraprofessionals, and other providers to meet the identified educational needs of all children with disabilities in the state.**

**1. Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

<b>Number (FTE) of Employed Fully Certified Personnel</b>			
Position	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Special Education Teachers	8,077.31	7,967.81	8,455.02
Early Childhood Special Education Teachers	462.51	525.79	604.70
Process Coordinators	498.15	314.75	414.82
Special Education Directors	220.07	420.15	430.17
Paraprofessionals	7,298.82	7,015.42	7,226.27
Other Special Education and Related Services Personnel	1,193.21	1,248.99	1,345.03

<b>Total (FTE) Employed Teachers and Child Count School-Age</b>			
Year	FTE Teachers	Child Count	Student/Teacher Ratio
2000-2001	8,696.64	129,345	14.87
2001-2002	8,757.27	132,626	15.14
2002-2003	9,159.93	134,118	14.64
<b>Early Childhood Special Education</b>			
Year	FTE Teachers	Child Count	Student/Teacher Ratio
2000-2001	552.63	8,036	14.54
2001-2002	597.18	9,022	15.11
2002-2003	668.03	10,049	15.04

Source: Child count data from Screen 11 of Core Data Collection System as of 02/20/04. Personnel data from 618 data reported on OSEP Table 2

Data show that numbers of special education personnel are generally increasing and that student/teacher ratios are reasonable. This is a statewide analysis and there are likely regional shortages. The Division is currently exploring options for changing/enhancing the data collection on special education personnel. The current collection only provides case management data and does not really demonstrate how special education teachers are spending their time or what sorts of delivery models are being utilized throughout the state. Regional analysis is needed as better data become available.

**Monitoring Data:**

**General Administration 4** -- The public agency identifies and implements activities to support a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) as required

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	93	1	0	1	1		1.1%
2002-2003	95	2	0	2	2		2.1%

Indicator A 101800 -- CSPD activities have been implemented

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	92	1	0	1	1		1.1%
2002-2003	90	2	2				2.2%

**Personnel 1** -- Caseloads of special education and related service personnel are within state standards

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	84	9	2	1	1		10.7%
2002-2003	81	3	3				3.7%

**Personnel 2** -- The district implements procedures as required for any reported ancillary personnel.

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	65	7	1	0			10.8%
2002-2003	55	6	6				10.9%

**Personnel 3** – The district follows proper procedures for hiring, training and reporting paraprofessionals.

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	93	8	1	0			8.6%
2002-2003	86	6	6				7.0%

**Special Education and Related Services 5** -- The kind and amount of related services is determined by the IEP team based on individual needs rather than factors such as administrative convenience or availability of personnel.

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	79	16	2	1	1		20.3%
2002-2003	40	4	4				10.0%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04.

Formulas: Percent of districts reviewed out of compliance = Number of districts out of compliance at initial review/Total districts/agencies reviewed

Monitoring data show that a relatively low percentage of districts are found out of compliance on standards dealing with special education personnel. Most of the districts found out of compliance those districts have corrected noncompliance by the first follow-up. The most notable decrease in the percentages of noncompliance is seen for caseloads and individualized decisions.

Data also show that 98-99% of districts reviewed have identified and implemented activities that support a Comprehensive System of Professional Development thus indicating that personnel have an avenue to become better prepared to meet the educational needs of children with disabilities.

**2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

Targets had not been set for the 2002-2003 school year. Targets were established in conjunction with the improvement plan which was submitted in July 2003.

**3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

Missouri was in the improvement planning phase of the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process during the 2002-2003 school year. Increasing elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities were selected as priority areas by the Part B Steering Committee. Two committees of stakeholders each met for two two-day sessions in April 2003. These committees worked through a root cause analysis and identified strategies and activities that would increase elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities. Both committees identified the training and professional development of general and special education personnel as being critical to increasing performance in the priority areas. These activities began during the 2003-2004 school year.

**4. Projected Targets:**

- Analyze duties, caseloads, instructional time and certification standards for special education teachers in Missouri.
- Revise data collection on special education personnel as necessary
- Additional projected targets can be found in the Future Activities table.

**5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:**

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
2.4.1 GS.IV BF.IV	A) Conduct a statewide study regarding the current duties, amounts of instructional time and caseloads for special education personnel.	2.4.1.1 Request for Proposal (RFP) or Invitation for Bid (IFB) developed to conduct study 2.4.1.2 Survey and sample size developed 2.4.1.3 Survey conducted 2.4.1.4 Survey results analyzed 2.4.1.5 Meeting convened with stakeholders regarding results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey report with recommendations available</li> </ul>	<b>Timelines:</b> <b>2003-2004</b> <b>Study conducted</b>  <b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance  <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B
2.4.2 GS.IV BF.IV	B) Revise Core Data reporting of special education personnel.	2.4.2.1 Changes to existing core data reporting identified 2.4.2.2 Web screens revised 2.4.2.3 Appropriate district staff trained on changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revision to screen implemented</li> <li>• Revised Personnel Reporting System implemented</li> </ul>	<b>Timelines:</b> 2004-2005 Revision to screen implemented  2005-2006 System changes implemented  <b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance  <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B



IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
2.4.3 GS.IV BF.IV	C) Analyze the results of study and core data reporting to determine if changes are needed for special education certification standard/requirements consistent with No Child Left Behind (NCLB).	2.4.3.1 Survey results shared with Teacher and Urban Education Division and other stakeholder groups. 2.4.3.2 Recommendations identified and developed for certification changes if required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendations for certification changes, if required, are identified and developed</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timelines:</b> 2006-2007 Recommendations identified and developed</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance</p> <p><u>Funding Type:</u> Part B</p>
2.4.4 GS.IV BF.IV	D) Analyze recommendations to develop strategies/ recommendations for expansion of instructional time for special education personnel.	2.4.4.1 IDEA reauthorization reviewed to determine the impact of changes on reduction of paperwork/and instructional time. 2.4.4.2 Collaboration with stakeholders to develop a grant regarding paperwork reduction and increased instructional time. 2.4.4.3 Report with recommendations regarding instructional time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report with recommendations available</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timelines:</b> 2006-07 Report complete</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance</p> <p><u>Funding Type:</u> Part B</p>

**GS.V State procedures and practices ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data.****1. Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):****Special Education Data Collection Processes:**

Missouri utilizes a web based data collection system to collect data including, but not limited to, the five types of data reported and verified for Section 618, Part B of IDEA. The Division of Special Education Data Coordination section has responsibility for assisting with improving the integrity of special education data collected within the Core Data Collection System.

The Core Data Collection System contains screens which are used to collect data from districts. Districts are required to enter data as directed in the Core Data Collection System Manual within specified timelines. Screens 8, 9 and 13/14 collect data on all students. Screens 11 and 12 collect data exclusively on students with disabilities. The following table specifies collection domains, data variables, due dates, and verification procedures pertaining to screens monitored by the Division of Special Education Data Coordination section.

**Special Education Reporting Table**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Collection Domain</b>	<b>Data Variables Required</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Verification Procedures</b>
Core Data Screen 8 (Post-Graduate Follow-Up)	Follow-up on previous year's graduates (February Cycle of the Core Data Collection System)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Post-graduation activity (i.e. 4 Year College, 2 Year College, Non-College, Military, Employment, Other or Unknown)</li> <li>o Gender</li> <li>o Race/Ethnicity</li> <li>o Disabled (subset with IEPs)</li> <li>o VR Cooperative (subset of disabled)</li> </ul>	February 15 (Special Education Listserv (SELS) notification sent to districts in January)	Data is provided on Special Education District Profiles for review by districts (description follows in Processes to Facilitate Usage of Data).
Core Data Screen 9 (Discipline Incidents)	Suspension/Expulsion for ten or more consecutive days or for more than 10 cumulative days (June Cycle of the Core Data Collection System)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Grade</li> <li>o School</li> <li>o Date of offense</li> <li>o Type of offense</li> <li>o Type of weapon</li> <li>o Race/Ethnicity</li> <li>o Gender</li> <li>o Primary disability</li> <li>o Type of removal</li> <li>o Length of removal</li> <li>o Repeat offender (Y/N)</li> <li>o Modified length (Y/N)</li> <li>o Alternative placement (Y/N)</li> </ul>	June 30 but no later than July 15 (SELS notification sent to districts in April)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Districts receive an error notification (i.e. edit button is displayed) when any field on screen 9 has not been completed or if invalid combinations have been chosen.</li> <li>-Data Coordination may randomly check a district's data for errors or questionable reporting, e.g. if the district has frequently asked questions or experienced problems in previous year.</li> </ul>

Title	Collection Domain	Data Variables Required	Due Date	Verification Procedures
Core Data Screen 11 (Child Count, Placement and Census)	Child Count, Census and Placement of students receiving services as of December 1 (December Cycle of the Core Data Collection System)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age as of December 1</li> <li>Primary Disability</li> <li>Placement</li> <li>Gender</li> <li>Race/Ethnicity</li> </ul>	December 15 (SELS notification sent to districts in November)	<p>-In addition to reviewing error reports, data are reviewed for significant year to year changes. Districts are notified as necessary.</p> <p>-Data Coordination personnel generate child count and placement (educational environments) data verification sheets for each school district upon completion of data entry. Verification sheets are sent to districts for review and for signature.</p>
Core Data Screen 12 (Exiters)	Exiter Data (June Cycle of the Core Data Collection System)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age as of December 1</li> <li>Primary disability</li> <li>Exit category</li> <li>Gender</li> <li>Race/Ethnicity</li> </ul>	June 30 but no later than July 15 (SELS notification sent to districts in April)	<p>-Number of students by disability and by total is compared to previous year. Significant percentage changes are noted (<math>\pm 20\%</math> for all exit categories except exiting special education or death which is <math>\pm 15\%</math>).</p> <p>-Data Coordination may verify data by comparing exiter data entered for students' ages 14 to 22 years with child count and educational environments data entered for the respective reporting year (Screen 11). Exit categories may be reviewed for inordinate increases or decreases.</p>
Core Data Screen 13/14 (Graduates, Transfers And Dropouts)	Graduate, Transfer and Dropout data (June Cycle of the Core Data Collection System)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender</li> <li>Race/Ethnicity</li> <li>IEP</li> </ul>	June 30 but no later July 15 (SELS notification sent to district in April)	Verification by Data Coordination is limited to cross checking the number of IEP students reported by selected districts to the number reported on Screen 12.
Core Data Screens 18 and 20 (Educator, Course and Assignment Data)	Data includes Section 618, Part B data, i.e. the number of full-time equivalent employed to provide special education and related services (October Cycle of the Core data Collection System)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Screen 18 (Educator Data):</u></li> <li>Educator information</li> <li>Career information</li> <li>Salary information</li> <li><u>Screen 20 (Course and Assignment Data):</u></li> <li>Course and assignment information</li> <li>Course enrollment data</li> <li>Assignment start and end dates, Vocationally funded courses must report on gender, race, handicapped, disadvantaged, graduates and adults enrolled</li> </ul>	October 15	Division of Special Education Funds Management personnel verify general reporting accuracy of special education and related services personnel data from public school districts. Verification by Data Coordination entails perusing data for significant increases or decreases from year to year
Core Data Screen 19 (Professional Development)	Number of educators engaging in high quality professional development (June Cycle of the Core Data Collection System)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School</li> <li>Educator name</li> <li>Engaged in high quality professional development (Y/N based on criteria)</li> </ul>	June 30	Data are collected and verified by School Core Data Section in the Division of School Improvement

Reporting Accuracy:

The primary methods of facilitating accurate reporting by districts are as follows:

- Core Data Collection System Manual - The *Core Data Collection System Manual* covers data entry and provides definitions and descriptions for reporting data. Changes/revisions are solicited, considered and initiated by School Core Data in June each year. Updated manuals are distributed to districts each fall.
- Error Defaults - Error checks have been incorporated into the web-based data collection system for invalid data reporting. When particular errors occur, an edit button will be displayed on the data entry screen. If a district's data entry screen is free from particular errors then no edit button will be displayed.
- Error Reports - The mainframe generates error reports upon district submission of the reporting cycle. Error reports list the district and their respective reporting error(s). Data Coordination personnel review these reports for significant errors and notify districts accordingly.
- Web Page - In addition to the *Core Data Collection System Manual*, Data Coordination provides further information on the Division of Special Education's Data Coordination web page. Links established on Data Coordination's web page provide general reporting guidelines, definitions/descriptions, frequently asked questions and examples. Both sources ensure the availability and uniformity of information provided to districts with regard to the data to be collected and reported.
- Technical Assistance - Data Coordination provides training annually to school district personnel. Topics include, but are not limited to, reporting requirements and facilitating data integrity. New administrators learn how to enter required core data elements and understand the significance of the data for decision making at the local, state, and federal levels. Data Coordination also provides ongoing technical assistance to school district personnel relative to the web-based data collected for special education (districts may call or email to ask questions). Person to person assistance facilitates and verifies reporting accuracy. Discussions with districts provide pertinent information regarding the clarity of the *Core Data Collection System Manual* and the clarity of data entry fields (including error defaults).
- Screen Prints - Upon completing data entry, districts may print a paper report or screen print to verify data entered.
- Other Pertinent Information - Data Coordination personnel verify data upon submission of the respective reporting cycle from all districts. This entails reviewing error reports and reviewing samples of selected districts' web screens and data reports for ambiguities, significant increases or decreases, omissions, etc. Data Coordination notifies districts via e-mail or phone of errors or of questionable entries in need of correction or substantiation. Districts notify Data Coordination when corrections have been completed. Re-verification of data ensures appropriate revisions have been made.
- Verification Procedures - Outlined in Special Education Reporting Table.
- Monitoring: This is conducted through the Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) and on-site reviews

Processes to Facilitate Usage of Data - State and District Profiles:

In addition to federal reports, performance reports, and ad hoc reports, Part B data are used for profiling each public school district's data and statewide data annually.

The State Profile and District Profiles are compiled annually in the fall and provide trend data from screens 08, 09, 11 and 12 of the Core Data Collection System as well as assessment data. Used in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) (Section RsMo. 161.092), Profiles provide data concerning:

- School age and early childhood disability incidence rates
- Educational environment (placement) percents overall and by disability
- Child count and percentages by race/ethnicity
- Achievement data for students with disabilities (levels of progress and indices for all grade levels and content areas assessed with the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)

- Graduation rates for students with disabilities
- Dropout rates for students with disabilities
- Post-graduate follow-up for students with disabilities (employment and continuing education)
- Discipline incident rates for disabled and non-disabled students and by disability

**2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

Targets had not been set for the 2002-2003 school year.

**3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

Data compiled for state and district profiles suggest reporting accuracy has improved over the past few years. District profiles provided districts with information for compliance monitoring and for improvement plan development thus providing an impetus for improving the accuracy of the data collected and reported by districts. Resultantly, the data have become more reliable.

Missouri was in the improvement planning phase of the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process during the 2002-2003 school year. Increasing elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities were selected as priority areas by the Part B Steering Committee. Two committees of stakeholders each met for two two-day sessions in April 2003. These committees worked through a root cause analysis and identified strategies and activities that would increase elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities. Both committees identified the need for data-based decision making in order to increase performance in the priority areas.

**4. Projected Targets:**

- Continue to work with districts to improve the accuracy of the data collected and reported.
- Additional targets are included in the Future Activities table.

**5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:**

See also BF.IV and BT

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
1.1.6 GS.I GS.II	F) Work with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Core Data to make necessary revisions to the Core Data Collection System Screen 11–Child Count and Placement (Educational Environments) in order to collect accurate data from school districts regarding youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	<p>1.1.6.1 Districts with students in city/county jails identified</p> <p>1.1.6.2 Verification of child count is conducted</p> <p>1.1.6.3 Web screen and directions revised</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screen 11 collection revised if required</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timelines:</b> <b>2003-2004</b> <b>Child count verification activities conducted</b></p> <p>December 2005 Screen 11 changes implemented</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance Data Coordination</p> <p><u>Funding Type:</u> Part B</p>
2.3.5 GS.II BF.IV	E) Develop and implement a web-based application for the special education district profile.	<p>2.3.5.1 Collaboration with MSIP and Core Data to develop Web reporting of the data.</p> <p>2.3.5.2 Policy developed to address the issues of confidentiality and the reporting of small cell size.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Districts have access to special education district profile on the web</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timelines:</b> 2004-2005 Web based application developed</p> <p>2005-2006 Profile available on web</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <u>Section Responsibility</u> Data Coordination</p> <p><u>Funding Type:</u> Part B</p>